



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

**MAILED**

**NOV 19 2009**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

LOUIS J. WILLE  
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
P O BOX 4000  
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000

In re Patent No. 7,557,143 :  
Ryono, et al. : DECISION DISMISSING  
Application No. 10/826,100 : REQUEST FOR  
Issue Date: July 7, 2009 : RECONSIDERATION OF  
Filed: April 15, 2004 : PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT  
Attorney Docket No. : UNDER 37 CFR 1.705  
LA0120 NP :

This is in response to the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT PERIOD IN GRANTED PATENT UNDER 37 C.F.R §§ 1.181 & 1.705(d), filed August 5, 2009. Patentees request that the determination of patent term adjustment be corrected from six hundred fifty-three (653) days to one thousand seven (1,007) days.

The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment is DISMISSED with respect to making any change in the patent term adjustment determination under 35 U.S.C. § 154(b) of 653 days.

**BACKGROUND**

This application was filed on April 15, 2004. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed on April 3, 2008. On July 7, 2009, the application matured into U.S. Patent No. 7,557,143, with a revised patent term adjustment of 653 days. The Office determined that the 353 days of Office delay pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) and 37 CFR 1.702(b)<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 37 CFR 1.702(b) provides, in pertinent part, that:

Failure to issue a patent within three years of the actual filing date of the application. Subject to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 154(b) and this subpart, the term of an original patent shall be adjusted if the issuance of the patent was delayed due to the failure of the Office to issue a patent within three years after the date on which the application was filed under

overlaps with the 682 days of Office delay pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) and 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1) and (a)(2)<sup>3,4</sup> accorded prior to the filing of the request for continued examination. A period of adjustment of 101 days of Office delay subsequent to the filing of the request for continued examination was entered pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a)(2). No additional days of patent term adjustment were entered at issuance under the three-year pendency provision. Given the applicant delay of 29 days, the patent issued with a revised patent term adjustment of 653 ((538 + 43 + 101) - 29) days.

On August 5, 2009, patentees timely submitted this request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment (with required fee), asserting that the correct number of days of Patent Term Adjustment is 1,007 days under the courts interpretation of the overlap provision as set forth in Wyeth v. Dudas, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. 2008). Patentees assert that pursuant to Wyeth, a PTO delay under §154(b)(1)(A) overlaps with a delay under §154(b)(1)(B) only if the delays "occur on the same day." Patentees maintain that the total non-

---

35 U.S.C. 111(a) or the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application.

<sup>2</sup> As of the filing of the RCE on April 3, 2008, the application was pending three years and 353 days.

<sup>3</sup> 37 CFR § 1.702, provides grounds for adjustment of patent term due to examination delay under the Patent Term Guarantee Act of 1999 (original applications, other than designs, filed on or after May 29, 2000).

(a) Failure to take certain actions within specified time frames. Subject to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 154(b) and this subpart, the term of an original patent shall be adjusted if the issuance of the patent was delayed due to the failure of the Office to:

(1) Mail at least one of a notification under 35 U.S.C. 132 or a notice of allowance under 35 U.S.C. 151 not later than fourteen months after the date on which the application was filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) or fulfilled the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 371 in an international application;

(2) Respond to a reply under 35 U.S.C. 132 or to an appeal taken under 35 U.S.C. 134 not later than four months after the date on which the reply was filed or the appeal was taken;

<sup>4</sup> A restriction requirement was not mailed until December 5, 2006, fourteen months and 538 days after the application filing date of April 15, 2004. Additionally, a final Office action was not mailed until December 7, 2007, four months and 43 days after a response was filed on June 25, 2007.

overlapping PTO delay under §154(b)(1)(A) & (B) is 1,036 (682 + 354) days as these periods do not occur on the same day. Further, given the applicant delay of 29 days, patentees assert entitlement to 1,007 (1,036 - 29) days of patent term adjustment.

#### OPINION

Patentees' interpretation of the period of overlap has been considered, but found inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of the overlap provision, 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

to the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f)*<sup>5</sup> and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of

---

<sup>5</sup> Likewise, 37 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See *Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule*, 65 Fed. Reg. 56366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See also *Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule*, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004). See also *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004).

Further, as stated in the *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the period during which the application was pending before the Office beginning on the application filing date under 35 U.S.C. 111(a), April 15, 2004, and ending on April 2, 2008, the day before the filing of the request for continued examination (not including any other periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)). The relevant period ends with the filing of the RCE as the three-year time frame specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) does not

include the period subsequent to the filing of the RCE. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i). Thus, only the 581 days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the filing of the request for continued examination, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1) and (a)(2) is considered in determining overlap. The 101 days for Office delay under 37 CFR 1.702(a)(2) occurring subsequent to the filing of the request for continued examination is not considered.

The 353 days of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(b) overlap with the 682 days of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1) and (a)(2). 682 days is the actual number of days issuance of the patent was delayed.

Accordingly, at issuance, the Office properly entered no additional days of patent term adjustment.

#### CONCLUSION

In view thereof, the Office affirms that the revised determination of patent term adjustment at the time of the issuance of the patent is 653 days (682 (538 + 43 + 101) days of Office delay - 29 days of applicant delay).

The Office acknowledges submission of the \$200.00 fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.18(e). No additional fees are required.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to Kenya A. McLaughlin, Petitions Attorney, at (571) 272-3222.

*Christina Tartera Donnell*

Christina Tartera Donnell  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions